DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 151 HE 016 225

AUTHOR Geis, George L.; Smith, Ron
TITLE If Professors Are Adults.
PUB DATE 11 Apr 83
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education; *College Faculty; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; Individualized Instruction; Student Educational Objectives; Student Needs; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Educators; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

Strategies of faculty development are considered, along with possible roles of faculty developers. The research on adult education is reviewed, and two areas are discussed: reasons why adults participate in adult education, barriers to participation, and self-directed learning activities. It is suggested that the application of some principles of adult education to faculty development activities may be beneficial. The following roles of the faculty developers are proposed: helping the inservice faculty members to define their learning needs and goals; finding resources that are appropriate to learners' needs; and developing benchmarks toward the goal. It is argued that faculty development programs have not adequately defined learner needs, which is a key principle of adult education programming. In addition, the adult learning strategy of providing individual or individualized instruction is suggested for faculty development programs. The tendency of faculty development courses to resemble college courses is also criticized. Finally, it is suggested that the attitude of many faculty developers is more like that of the traditional teacher than that of the adult educator-resource person. The appropriateness of the adult-learner model to faculty development is further explored. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230151

If Professors are Adults

George L. Geis

McGill University

and

Ron Smith

Concordia University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

George L. Geis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 016 225

American Educational Research Association

April 11, 1983

Session 5.05

Montreal

Abstract

The paper suggests that the application of some principles of Adult Education to Faculty Development activities may increase the impact of those activities.

The paper includes a review of selected research in Adult Education, a discussion of possible roles of faculty developers, and strategies of faculty development. In the latter section two questions are explored: Are Adult Education principles currently being applied? (Three examples of applications are presented.) And: should faculty developers adopt Adult Education strategies?

The paper concludes with some suggestions for the incorporation of Adult Education principles into faculty development activities.

If Professors are Adults[1]

The relatively low demand for the services of Faculty Development centers is one of the variables which may well affect the success and longevity of such groups. Our paper focuses on a concern which we assume to be related to demand and success: How we deal with our clients as learners. The emphasis in this paper is on the development of the professor as teacher, admittedly only one aspect in faculty development.

"Adult Education." The visibility of Adult Education has dramatically increased in the last decade or so. It is far from an easily identified, coherent, well-focused and well-researched discipline. Adult educators may address problems of functional literacy, of community development, of bringing high school graduates and college dropouts into the postsecondary system, of training vocationally oriented skills, of redefining leisure time in order to make it more meaningful, of professional updating and recycling. Most authors in this area begin by listing numerous and often conflicting definitions and allow the reader (in the spirit of adult learning) to choose among them.

It seems to us that there are basically two streams of Adult Education.

"Til death do us part." One view sees Adult Education as a continuation of the process that began when the individual was four or five years old. It continues the previous education of the learner and continues it in the institutions and employing the methods with which he or she has become all

too familiar. Lifelong education, in this case, is synonymous with lifelong schooling. Thus the cynical comment of Lister (quoted by Patricia Cross, 1981): "Is lifelong education a guarantee of permanent inadequacy?" "Is there school after death?"

Thus, many continuing education and extension units are well named. They offer a continuation or extension of previous educational experiences.

Mandated professional updating (called **récyclage** in Quebec) often turns out to mean simply that one must go back to school for additional courses. This in spite of the fact that just as prolonged incarceration does not lead to rehabilitation, so increased time in school does not equal greater time on task and increased achievement.

"And now for something different." The second view of Adult Education is suggested by its proponents' preference for the term **nontraditional education** rather than **continuing education.**[2] Houle (1980), Knowles (1980), and Tough (1971) propose a new model for Adult Education. In fact, in many ways it is not very different from models proposed in the 1960's and 70's by those seeking radical reform of the primary and secondary educational systems (e.g., Holt, 1967; Neill, 1960). The model which we will be discussing in this paper has several key attributes. Admittedly we will not do justice to them here for we want to move on to our special interest in faculty development.

The role of "educator" is that of guide, resource person and coevaluator. Such a person assists the candidate-for-learning in defining his or her own needs, finding resources that are appropriate both to the needs and the learner, and developing benchmarks of progress toward the goal. In addition, the resource person is able to aid the learner in developing realistic

goals (e.g., in obtaining information about the certification requirements for a particular vocation or profession).

Another key attribute is that learning is voluntary. Clients of the primary and secondary educational systems (children and parents) are threatened with fines and jail terms if children fail to attend the educational institution. The adult learning model emphasizes that learners are in the learning situation because they choose to be there and that they will remain in that situation only as long as it appears to be profitable to them. This emphasis upon voluntary learning dramatically affects all the other features of the models, its acceptance by various educational groups, and its means of implementation.

Among the group of people who find this model attractive are a number of researchers. A brief look at some of their work is appropriate to our discussion.

Research on Adult Education. First, it should be noted that "research" in this area is sparse. Most of the literature describes programs, projects and activities rather than being directed to research or theoretical concerns.

Nevertheless two areas offer at least some research of relevance to this paper: participation and self-directed learning activities.

Studies on the reasons why adults participate or do not participate in learning activities (e.g., Houle, 1980; Tough, 1968; Morstain & Smart, 1974; Carp, Peterson & Roelfs, 1974) would be more relevant to this discussion if the groups studied included a greater number of professors. Nevertheless it is of interest to note that frequent reasons for participation include: In order to accomplish specific goals (e.g., job advancement); to participate in a learning for its own sake; and to engage in an activity for the sake of the

activity itself (e.g., to provide social contact, avoid boredom). Learners commonly report more than one reason as important in determining their participation. A breakdown into groups of the Carp, et al. results shows that "professionals" rank highly these reasons: Become better informed; personal enjoyment; enrichment; curiosity/learning for the sake of learning; job advancement; meeting requirements of employer or profession.

Barriers to participation typically include what Cross terms **situational** (e.g., cost in dollars and time), **institutional** (e.g., "courses not scheduled when I can attend") and **dispositional** (e.g., tired of school and classrooms). Obviously, dollar cost to the learner is rarely a consideration in faculty development activities. Probably neither are such dispositional barriers as not liking to engage in learning activities although faculty members may be discriminating in the kinds of activities they are attracted to. Our impression is that a prime candidate as a barrier is "time" which in fact turns out to be a matter of priority. The data from Carp, et al. supports that contention with regard to professionals in general.

There are few studies on the characteristics of those who engage in self-directed learning projects (e.g., Armstrong, 1971). Related to that question however is the extensive work that has been carried out by Allan Tough. He has analyzed information from a sizeable number of people who have engaged in learning projects [3] (and he finds that most adults do engage in such activity frequently, a finding somewhat dependent upon his definitions).

Tough's name is almost synonymous with self-directed learning projects. In his work (e.g., Tough, 1968, 1971, 1978) he reports on interviews with adults about what kinds of learning projects they undertake, the reasons for doing so, how they carry them out, etc. Some of Tough's observations (e.g.,

how many adults engage in self-directed learning projects) are quite different than those of other investigators. Nevertheless his is the major, continuing, programmatic research effort.

Tough's main theme is that most people engage in continued learning throughout their lives. They do so frequently and their projects consume a considerable portion of their waking hours. Some other points that his research makes are:

1. Most learning projects are undertaken for several reasons, i.e., there is generally not a single motivation but a combination of motives, some strong and some weaker contributors.
2. Most learning projects involve numerous resources. Several people are consulted in the process and a variety of print and nonprint resources are used.
3. Typically the self-directed learner consults with friends. A key attribute of the resource person is not expertise but warmth and provision of an easy atmosphere for discussion and planning.
4. "Anticipated benefits constitute a significant portion of a person's total motivation for learning" (Tough, 1979, p. 5). Though hardly a startling observation, this reminds us that the student undertaking "voluntary" learning activities must see clearly a purpose in doing so - a purpose that has value in the light of his or her own perceived needs.
5. Tough includes some faculty members in his sample. He reports that they typically undertake each year a large number of learning projects (11-12) and spend large amounts of time on them (1500-1700 hours).

Tough suggests a picture of the self-directed learner which somewhat resembles that of the athlete in training: using as resources a coach, other trainees, a few model figures, perhaps a training buddy, some books,

videotapes of performance, etc.

We might consider, at this point, how close we come to setting up a similar environment for our clients in faculty development. For example: How often do we suggest that they use resources other than ourselves? How often do we help them set goals and provide an array of resources? How often have we been, as Pascal (in Rhodes & Hounsell, 1980) puts it, "creating new needs rather than identifying and solving existing ones?"

Academics as Adult Learners

Considering research reports and one's own observations over the years, how well do academics meet the profile of successful adult learners? Many professors seem to be eternal students; indeed, one of the attractions of academia is the provision of time and resources which allow one to study and learn for a lifetime. Academics tend to be skillful at independent learning, pursuing their own learning plans and internalizing evaluative criteria for their performances. In the winnowing out process of high school, college and graduate school, these are the survivors. And given the typical techniques used in education the probability of survival is certainly higher if one has the skills of independent learning and is able to monitor and motivate oneself through that long process of acquiring knowledge and skills. Academics often speak of the rewards of learning for its own sake; they seem to aggressively pursue knowledge for the joy of acquisition in the same way a collector of paperweights, postcards, or paintings might add new items to his or her collection. They read widely. When they travel it is often with the objective of learning more about the places they visit. They define the skills and techniques that they need to know "in order to do the job better" and often show a lifetime of acquiring additional skills. Thus two

of the frequently cited motives for pursuing learning activities (need to know how to do something and the joy of knowing) seem to be common in this population. Consequently, we might conclude that this is one of the ideal populations to which to apply the principles of adult learning we have just been discussing.

Roles For Faculty Developers

While typically in self-directed learner projects, it is the learner who is in control of planning and execution, most Adult Education spokesmen agree that the learner should have access to a skilled resource person (or several such persons). Not teachers, these resource people should act, in Tough's terminology, as assistants to the learner. And Tough further suggests two roles for these assistants to the learner: Helping with goal setting and strategies.

Thus the faculty developer assisting in setting goals might increase the amount of time he or she spends in explicating and clarifying the faculty members' goals. He or she might also assist in reality testing those goals (e.g., if you accomplish the goal will it bring about the desired results?). Faculty developers who have a background in instructional design are familiar with the key role goal explication (and related activities such as front end analysis) plays in the development of instructional packages.

The same kind of procedure can be applied to the development of an individual's learning plan. (For specific application of an instructional systems model to faculty development, see Geis, pp. 121-129 in Rhodes & Hounsell, 1980.)

Related to goal explication is needs assessment. Again the literature on instructional design (e.g., Kaufman & English, 1979) is relevant. While

adult educators have not yet offered practical techniques for assessing needs, the literature on instructional design is beginning to do so (see Rossett, 1982).

The **strategy consultant** offers advice on planning the learning episode taking into consideration available resources, learner characteristics, etc. Thus, he or she acts as an information resource or an access to learning materials. Many faculty development centers have already adopted this role. Newsletters briefly review available materials, identify other persons on campus who might act as consultants, and announce conferences and meetings relevant to instructional improvement. Perhaps more of this kind of activity, especially if it reflected increased tailoring of prescriptions to individual needs and interests, might be tried.

Suggesting goal and strategy consultant as roles for faculty developers is not new. Gaff (in Rhodes & Hounsell, 1980) has written: "At its best faculty development is a continuous process of attending to the professional and human needs of men and women on the faculty and the rest of the staff and doing whatever is necessary to make work more productive, relationships more fulfilling and life more rewarding" (p. 28).

In another article in the same volume, Hans Jalling notes that in Sweden, staff development is seen as "...a listening device...not a preaching one" (p. 36).

And Piper (1977, p. 33) says: "The essential spirit of 'staff development' is caught by a group of colleagues meeting together to identify their common objectives, identifying problems in their achievement and then jointly deciding on a course of action."

Strategies for Faculty Development

Let us examine two questions. The first is: have we treated our clients as adult learners according to the model proposed or have we been treating them according to a continuing education (or "teacher training") model? Secondly, the above discussion suggests that academics are an ideal target population for nontraditional learning techniques. Should we, then, adopt those techniques, and if we do, what are possible problems in the application of these techniques to faculty development activities?

Are adult education principles applied? There exists a small literature describing the goals of faculty development units and their activities, for example, Gaff (1975), Donald and Shore (1976), Alexander and Yelon (1972), and Centra (1976). It is disappointingly small but it, combined with reports and other sources of information, offer at least a sketchy picture of faculty development activities. The assessment of learners' needs - a key concept in adult education - is given lip service by such units but relatively few such assessments seem to be carried out formally. Our impression is that there is a wide variation in the reactivity of such units to clients' perceived needs and to the priority assigned to aggressively finding out such perceptions. On the one hand there seem to be units in which the members engage in extensive and intensive personal consultation in order to uncover the needs of the clients. At the other extreme are groups who offer, say, a series of workshops or newsletters on topics which they, the faculty developers, consider to be important.

Typically, when centers do survey a campus for its needs they do so either using a questionnaire form which allows potential clients to indicate which of several choices they would be interested in or a rating form

indicating what they have found or might find valuable. Alternatively, centers conduct evaluations on particular offerings; such evaluations are carried out among the population of participants in those activities (e.g., attendees at a workshop).

Surveys of the faculty on a campus often result in a low return rate (in itself a concern) and they suffer from the problem that plagues all such forced choice instruments: the respondent may well be ranking, sincerely and with some care, a variety of choices none of which are in truth of interest to him or her. Your dining companions in the Chinese restaurant may dutifully choose spring rolls instead of Wonton soup and Chow Mein rather than crispy duckling, but they may be too polite to inform you that as a matter of fact they would prefer Italian food. The low return rate on many surveys indicates how important any of the items on the entire list of choices really are to most of the faculty.

Evaluations of particular events provide useful formative feedback but obviously only from those people who have already chosen to participate in that event. They fail to tell us anything about the perceived needs of the other 75% or 80% of the faculty.

Part of the answer to the first question appears to be that we have not all and consistently addressed ourselves to the key principle of defining learner needs in our activities.

Another part of the answer requires a look at our teaching techniques. Following principles of adult learning we would often engage in individual or at least individualized instruction with the teaching techniques being responsive to the learner's learning style, entering skills, and particular interests. Again, some centers seem to emphasize one-on-one consultation as a major way of dealing with clients but there is a proliferation of

presentations such as workshops and lecture series which seems inconsistent with Adult Education's emphasis on individualized learning. Traditionally designed courses, in particular, seem inappropriate for professionals who typically have carried out sophisticated self-assessment and identified specific, narrowly defined needs.

(Incidentally, other efforts at dealing with the teaching preparation of academics appear to be even more traditional. With a few exceptions, courses designed for teaching assistants resemble university courses in general. The curriculum design for a Doctor of Arts (a terminal degree analogous to a PhD but with the emphasis upon teaching rather than research) generally consists of a series of courses as well as some practicum experience. Orientations to teaching for new college and university faculty, relatively rare in Canada and the United States but more popular in England, also seem to follow more traditional teaching methods. The rallying point for those who propose required training or required updating for college and university teachers is usually stated in terms of courses and hours to be undertaken by the student at established institutions of higher learning. Some programs, for example the Performa and College Diploma programs in this province, designed to provide advanced training for college teachers, do represent exceptions or at least attempts to be exceptions to that generalization.)

In summary the teaching techniques used by members of faculty development units may too often reflect the fact that many members of those units are drawn from Education or allied fields and have had long experiences as university or college teachers themselves. In short: offerings frequently look like college courses or miniature college courses.

Finally, we suggest that the attitude of many faculty developers more

closely resembles that of the traditional teacher than that of the adult educator-resource person described above. We faculty developers are likely to take the position not only that "I know and you don't," but also "I know what you need and you don't" and so we act as experts providing information in group learning situations. Such approaches may be entirely appropriate and not antagonistic to adult-learning principles provided that the participants have conducted self-needs assessments and determined such a learning episode would not only meet their needs but would be appropriate to their own learning style.

We are not proposing a sweeping indictment of our own work and that of our colleagues, nor are we indulging in self-flagellation. We merely point out that if one were to adopt the adult education strategies we have described, a number of faculty development units would probably have to change their ways to some degree at least.

Should we adopt Adult Education strategies? Would such an application of Adult Education principles present problems? That is the second question we asked at the outset of this section. Certainly the decision to invest time and energy in self-examination involving the comparison of our current strategies with adult-learner models should only be undertaken after we have explored how appropriate the model would be and how much effort would be involved in implementing it.

Reasons for adopting an Adult Education strategy or at least for reconsidering our current strategies seem to us to be obvious in the light of the points made earlier. Furthermore, we have recently been looking at various faculty development activities to provide an answer to the question: do current faculty development activities which represent the principles of

adult learning seem to be successful or even unusually successful? At the moment, we only have an impression but it is a strong impression that the answer is "yes." Three unusually successful programs can be cited as examples.

The Teaching Development Process which emanated from the Clinic to Improve University Teaching at the University of Massachusetts involves a careful collection of data from multiple sources in order to identify and clarify problems. Then, collaboratively, the faculty member and consultant decide on improvement goals and strategies. At all times the control of progress, the definition of the problem, and the selection of techniques for solving the problem are in the hands of the learner. As Bergquist and Philips (1977) wrote:

> "Considerable sensitivity and tact - even a willingness to abandon his or her agenda entirely - characterize the effective consultant...and after some agreement has been reached concerning the instructor's strengths and weaknesses, a decision must be made by the instructor as to whether he wishes to continue with the teaching improvement process or to terminate the consultation."

At both our own centers we have used the clinic process extensively and while it does not necessarily appeal to a great number of faculty members it draws a steady clientele who report high satisfaction upon completion of the process.

A second apparently successful faculty development program emphasizes individual faculty control and perception of needs within a growth contract model. Originally developed at Gordon College it is described in detail by Strunger and Bergquist (1978), Bergquist and Phillips (1981) and Pellino, et

al. (1981). The first step of the plan involves self-assessment by faculty members and the identification of goals and strategy for reaching those goals.

> "While faculty report that a principal attraction of the program is the available professional development financial support, most suggest that they found the process of self-assessment and goal-setting beneficial. Clearly there is a difference between the emphasis on faculty members' growth as guided by their self-perceived goals and a strategy which at the outset implies that they are defective in teaching and the improvement of teaching must be one of their objectives" (Pellino, et al., 1981).

The Center for Instructional Development at Syracuse University offers a third interesting example of employment of the strategies of Adult Education. Diamond (1975) emphasizes gathering information on needs and priorities from faculty (as well as from students, community, and administration) as the first step in generating a particular project or program. In contrast to many other centers which make use of the instructional development procedures, Diamond's Center applies those procedures only after extensive "front-end analysis."

It is our growing impression that numerous successful faculty development programs could be cited which demonstrate adult learning principles. Although the evidence is certainly informal and requires substantiation we think it is worthy of consideration.

Arguments **against** adopting the Adult Education strategy should be examined as well. Some of them are subtle and are too briefly dealt with here where the purpose is to raise points to further discussion rather than

to arrive at firm conclusions.

If it were evident that teaching improvement needs as perceived by faculty members, administrators, and faculty developers were isomorphic, the task would be primarily one of changing techniques in order to attract more clients and serve the faculty better. We have reported at several AERA sessions about our continuing work on faculty perceptions of their roles in teaching and learning (Geis, 1982; Geis & Smith, 1981). As we now put in order and reflect upon the large amount of information we have assembled we are increasingly convinced that there is a major disparity between the perceptions of faculty developers and professors. The disparity exists not only at the superficial level with regard to specific activities which might improve instruction but at a much deeper level involving the perceived roles of the professor and student, and of the need for and strategies for determining deficiencies in teaching and remediating them.

This poses a particularly knotty problem for work in faculty development. By addressing faculty perceived needs we may not be satisfying our own perceived needs (i.e., to assist the client in certain ways to solve "real" problems which we see existing). Many of us believe that we are able to diagnose weaknesses in the teaching/learning system. Furthermore, we believe that we can generalize (on the basis of years of experience and of sharing the experiences of others in our field) across large numbers of faculty members and conclude that they simply do not do certain things that would produce effective learning or that they do them poorly. How can we share with our clients those perceptions, that expertise, and assist them in at least considering the generalizations and conclusions we have spent much of a lifetime arriving at?

At a still deeper level, we are concerned that the Adult Education

model is driven by learner needs.

Several observations will suggest that potential learners (i.e., faculty members) are not likely to be highly motivated to give high priority to the need to improve instruction. Although teaching is often said by academics to be a high priority, a series of barriers seem to act as obstacles in the development of more sophisticated knowlege and skill in the area of teaching. We are all quite familiar with the groaning refrain that teaching is not really rewarded in many institutions; it suffers continually from its status as a second class citizen, always overshadowed by research and scholarship. To the extent that the perceived need for greater attention to teaching exists it may indeed be weakened or attenuated by the lack of institutional support for improvement in the area.

Even if we more optimistically take the situation in which support for teaching improvement does exist, are faculty members likely to rank the need to improve their teaching as a high priority item? Overwhelming evidence, from our own research and from questionnaire data, indicates that faculty members for the most part, are rather content with the quality of their teaching. They generally rank themselves (as do their students) above average in quality.

Mediating against the generation of teaching improvement as a high priority need in faculty members then, is the lack of impetus from the environment, i.e., a weak reward system in many institutions for teaching improvement. Coupled with that is the view many professors have of themselves as more than adequate with regard to their teaching abilities.

Now let us look at the optimal situation, one in which there is support for good teaching and a self-perceived need for improvement exists. We have explored in our own research what teachers do when they do have a

self-perceived need to improve their teaching. And, as we have suggested elsewhere, teachers generally do **not** conceive of improvement efforts as involving instructional experts. In the light of the research on Adult Education reviewed above, this should not surprise us. It is often the case that the adult learner does not seek out individuals with expertise but turns to friends, books, and to practitioners rather than to professional teachers.

The needs picture then, is a gloomy one in some respects. It does not appear that there are institutional pressures that generate needs in individual faculty members with regard to teaching improvement; professors do not perceive themselves as excessively deficient in teaching capabilities; and when they take steps to improve their teaching they do not typically involve teaching improvement experts in their learning plans.

The good news with regard to teaching improvement that has emerged from our own work confirms Tough's observations: many professors **do** engage in almost continual improvement activities. If teaching is an art (and many professors seem to see it as such) then improvement can be seen as an infinitely long-time challenge even though one does not view himself or herself as especially defective. Many of our respondents, while regarding themselves as excellent teachers, reported that they regularly engaged in activities which they would identify as teaching improvement activities. Typically these activities are strongly tied to increasing the professor's expertise in his or her particular discipline. Updating oneself in the content area, reorganizing that content for purposes of clarity and logic, increasing technical skills in one's area of expertise, and similar activities are frequently reported.

Summary Suggestions

Since this is a discussion rather than a research paper we would prefer to end with some summarizing remarks and suggestions rather than conclusions.

1. Professors seem ideally to meet the definition of the adult learner.[4] They are committed to being lifelong learners, are used to setting up their own learning plans, are often skilled in monitoring their own progress, and are sophisticated users of a variety of resources. Consequently, it would seem appropriate for faculty developers to become familiar with the Adult Education literature, recognizing ahead of time that if one applies to it the criteria of an academic discipline, it suffers from a lack of research, lack of theory, and an excess of evangelism.

   Although the professor may be an ideal adult learner, he or she typically seems to apply those skills of lifelong learning to the exploration of a subject matter discipline rather than to the business of teaching. (We realize we are making a distinction here that many professors would not make.) Nevertheless, attending to the professor's needs and interest and treating the professor as a sophisticated learner seems to be a more appropriate tack for us to take than mimicking the "continuing schooling" model (which paradoxically we often recommend against to our clients.)

2. The exploration of a professor's needs and interests may in itself be one of our major tasks and techniques as faculty developers and we may not have given it proper emphasis (see, e.g., Lindquist, 1979). Defining with the professor the teaching role and, indeed, the purpose of the university, can be a revealing experience for both parties. Our

own research interviews which explored those topics were reported by many of our interviewees to be particularly positive experiences. We suggest that we may be seduced by our own expertise into offering innumerable solutions to problems that are foreign to our clients. And conversely we may not put ourselves in the appropriate learning situation because we do not often probe our clients and learn more about teaching and learning at colleges and universities from them.

3. While the wailing continues that teaching improvement is unsupported by postsecondary institutions, changes are occurring which may produce a greater need for our services on campus. For example, departmental and program evaluations are now becoming commonplace. It has become increasingly evident that the evaluation of individual teachers can contribute some but not a great deal to the information bank that will assist administrators in making hard decisions in the next decade. Quite appropriately they have finally arrived at the necessity of evaluating the purposes and effectiveness of the collectivities that make up a college or university, namely departments and programs. Faculty developers are ideal consultants for such activities, not only as evaluators but as resource people to aid professors in shifting roles, in defining goals, and in prioritizing objectives.

Another example is an increasing interest in growth contracting as a vehicle for faculty development. The locked-in, aging professor of whom we hear so much today can present serious morale problems to higher education. One mechanism to open up and explore purposes, goals and plans to reach those goals is a growth contract. We suggest that the development of such growth contracts is in line with the more positive things proposed by adult educators and is appropriate to our

roles on campus.

In addition, as campuses move toward fully tenured, locked-in staff, there may be increasing need as Harding (1982) points out for faculty developers to assist faculty members in "finding satisfaction and fulfillment in a job and at a status which they have little prospect of changing for the next 20 years" (p. 9).

4. Pursuing the above point: many faculty development personnel, especially those drawn from an instructional design background, pride themselves in their skills in explicating problems. Though they enter through an entirely different set of doors than the group of faculty developers with a background in counselling they meet in the same lobby and find Adult Education waiting there. The explication of problems undertaken in collaboration with the professor may serve both our interests and theirs better than the offering of packaged solutions.

5. Following a suggestion from the Adult Education literature, we may do better by generating interest in our services through the development of peer groups than through traditional marketing techniques. The home of professors is typically a program or a department. Appeals to professors on the basis of some esoteric innovation may bring a number of them together (and they often may acquire valuable skills). But back in their own peer group they may seem to be genetic sports. Working with natural peer groups such as departments may be a far more powerful way of conveying our services than through the marketing techniques we typically use.

6. Professors view themselves for the most part as scholars and intellectuals. While adult learners of certain types may be fearful of engaging in educational activities, our population seems to be at the

other end of the distribution. They seem to be turned off by a lack of intellectual challenge. This is a delicate problem, for we are sometimes working with clients who in fact are relatively unsophisticated about teaching. We might well explore how to provide intellectually rich experiences to a group of people who are highly skilled and sophisticated in one area of their profession and naive in another.

7. Almost everybody "knows" something about everything. Of course, what they "know" may be fallacious. We caution professors not to view the students as a **tabula rasa.** Do we commit the same error with our clients? Whether we like it or not they **have** been teachers (some of them for many years); they are seen by others as teachers, and they see themselves as rather good teachers. They should have a rich set of experiences to bring to a discussion of teaching. They may not always be able to articulate those experiences as well as we would like and they may hold very different views and have different perceptions than we do. Nevertheless it is unlikely that they have kept their minds pristine on matters of teaching waiting, like Henry James' heiress, for us to arrive at their door. Perhaps we should consider much more seriously not only where they are coming from when we meet them, but also what contributions **they** can make to any exchanges with us.

8. On the other hand, we might examine whether we offer appropriate "low threat" entry options. We suspect, on the basis of our own experience and our interviews with professors, that in contrast to their demand for high intellectual challenge they often have insecurity about their teaching. We might examine to what extent we approach our clients more with a bulldozer than with a siren song. A variety of

options which allows clients to select a way into our operations may well increase participation rates.

9. We suggest that we should wrestle more with the problem of dealing with "professional" professors for whom teaching is often one of their lesser roles. For many professors, especially at universities, teaching is comparable to administrative service. Both teaching and administration are parts of the professor's career. Neither is seen as of central importance; no special preparation needed for either job. Inadequacy in either area may be tolerated because it is seen as a minor, adjunctive part of a professor's real role as scholar. After all, when defining an orange one does not emphasize the skin and seeds. It seems crucial to understand whether teaching is in fact seen as one of the professor's professions or is, indeed, an adjunctive activity to the profession of scholar. It is our impression that postsecondary teaching usually lacks some critical attributes of a profession (see, e.g., Houle's criteria including preparation, certification, etc.). At least a duality of scholar and teacher should be recognized along with the distinct possibility that those two professional roles may often be competing and sometimes antagonistic. Developing the awareness in our clients of their multiple roles and of distinctions between them may be a useful exercise for us to engage in.

10. All of this discussion raises fundamental problems about how faculty developers perceive their roles. Many of us have seen ourselves, in a sense, as traditional teachers with the university faculty instead of its undergraduates as our target population. We are not suggesting in this paper merely an adjustment of that role but the consideration of a new role as suggested in the Adult Education literature. Interestingly

enough, our content expertise in particular areas (e.g., test construction, variables affecting learner) may prove to be less relevant than our skills in instructional development (e.g., goal setting, needs analysis, problem solving).

We come away from this exploration of Adult Education and its application to faculty development with concerns and problems but with optimism and vitality. We suggest that we can learn from the Adult Education literature, especially that part of it that has been produced by those who have been involved with continuing education in the professions. Conversely we think that we in faculty development are in an ideal position to contribute to this important and growing concern: continued learning by adults.

Notes

1. Preparation of this paper and our research referred to in it were in part supported by grants from FCAC (Formation de chercheurs et d'action concertée).
2. Perhaps "lifelong learning" as contrasted with "lifelong education" is an even more appropriate term.
3. Note that these projects may involve formal educational activities such as taking classes but more often do not.
4. Hodgkinson (1974) offers an interesting application of the literature on adult development to college and university faculty members (and administrators).

References

Alexander, L. T., & Yelon, S. L. (Eds.) Instructional development agencies in highe. education. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1972.

Armstrong, D. Adult learners of low educational attainment: the self concepts, backgrounds, and educative behaviors of average and high learning adults of low educational attainment. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1971.

Bergquist, W. H. & Phillips, S. R. A handbook for faculty development, vol. I. Washington: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1975.

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. A handbook for faculty development, vol. II. Washington: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977.

Bergquist, W. H., & Phillips, S. R. A handbook for faculty development, vol. III. Washington: Council of Independent Colleges, 1981.

Carp, A., Peterson, R., & Roelfs, P. Adult learning interests and experiences. In Planning nontraditional programs, K. P. Cross and J. R. Valley, eds. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1974.

Centra, J. A. Faculty development practices in U.S. colleges and universities. Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

Cross, K. P. Adults as learners. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Diamond, R. M., et al. Instructional development for individualized learning in higher education. Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology, 1975.

Donald, J. G., & Shore, B. M. Annotated index to pedagogical services in Canadian universities and colleges. Montreal: McGill University, 1976.

Gaff, J. G. Toward faculty renewal: advances in faculty, instructional and organizational development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Geis, G. L. Perceptions of teaching and how they affect teaching

improvement efforts. In Improving university teaching: proceedings of the seventh international conference. Maryland: University of Maryland College/University of Tsukuba, 1982.

Geis, G. L., & Smith, R. Two in-depth examinations of professors. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 16, 1981.

Gustafson, K. L., & Bratton, B. Instructional improvement centers in higher education: a status survey. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Educational Communication and Technology, New Orleans, January, 1983.

Harding, A. G., Kaewsonthi, S., Roe, E., & Stevens, J. Professional development in higher education: state of the art and the artists. U.K.: University of Bradford, 1981.

Hodgkinson, H. L. Adult development: implications for faculty and administrators. Educational Record, fall 1974, 55 (4), 263-274.

Houle, C. O. Continuing learning in the professions. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

Holt, J. How children learn. New York: Pitman, 1967.

Kaufman, R., & English, F. W. Needs assessment, concept and application. Englewood Cliffs: Educational Technology, 1979.

Knowles, M. S. The modern practice of adult education from pedagogy to andragogy. Chicago: Follett, 1980.

Lindquist, J. (Ed.) Designing teaching improvement programs. Washington: The Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1979.

Morstain, B. R., & Smart, J. C. Reasons for participation in adult education courses: a multivariate analysis of group differences. Adult Education, 1974, 24 (2), 83-98.

Neill, A. S. Summerhill: a radical approach to child learning. New York: Hart, 1960.

Pellino, G. R., et al. Planning and evaluating professional growth programs for faculty. Ann Arbor: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of Michigan, July 1981.

Piper, D. W. University staff development: practical implications. In Staff development in higher education, L. Elton and K. Simmonds, eds. Guilford, Surrey: Society for Research in Higher Education, 1977.

Rhodes, D., & Hounsell, D. Staff development for the 1980's: international perspectives. Normal: Illinois State University Foundation, and Lancaster, U.K.: Institute for Research in Post-Compulsory Education, University of Lancaster, 1980.

Rossett, A. A typology for generating needs assessments. Journal of Instructional Development, fall 1982, 6 (1), 28-33.

Strunger, B. E., & Bergquist, W. H. Handbook for college administration. Washington: Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1978.

Tough, A. Why adults learn: a study of the major reasons for beginning and continuing a learning project. Monographs in Adult Education No. 3, Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1968.

Tough, A. Major learning efforts: recent research and future directions. In The adult learner: current issues in higher education. Washington: American Association for Higher Education, 1978.

Tough, A. The adult's learning project: a fresh approach to theory and practice in adult learning. Research in Education Series No. 4. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1971.